arXiv:1511.01249v1 [cs.CR] 4 Nov 2015

# On the Systematic Design of Privacy Policies and Privacy Architectures

Vinh Thong Ta
University of Central Lancashire (UCLan)
School of Physical Sciences and Computing (PSC)
Preston, UK
vtta@uclan.ac.uk

November 5, 2015

**Abstract**

In this paper, we address the problem of systematic privacy policy and privacy architecture design. We focus on two relevant aspects of privacy, namely, accountability and personal data control. We propose a systematic design approach of privacy policies adapting the current international data protection regulations, as well as an automated privacy architectures generation method from the corresponding policies. In particular, we propose a high-level policy language and an architecture language, as well as a systematic mapping procedure from policies to the corresponding architectures. We demonstrate the usability of our proposed approach on real-world systems such as Facebook.

## 1 Introduction

Personal data protection simply refer to a proper management of personal information and sometimes used in the European Union with respect to privacy related laws and regulation [16]. Conceptually, personal data aims to describe fact, opinion, and communication related to a particular person which is reasonable enough to be regarded as sensitive or confidential by the individual, which he/she might need to limit it from sharing, collection or use.

The main purpose of data protection regulations are creating rights for individuals who have their data processed, and taking responsibilities for those who store, process or transmit such data. For instance, the person who has its data processed has rights for requesting data deletion, correction, or constraint on forwarding. In Europe and Asia, the term 'personal data and personal information' are used in common perspectives while personally identifiable information (PII) is used in the USA [14], but they referred to a similar thing. Based on the Directive 95/46/EC of the European Parliament [16], personal data can be defined as any information that can be used to trace a particular individual, such as address, phone number, name, email address, date of birth, etc.. According to the data protection Act 1998 [21], personal data covers any data that can be used to identify a living individual. However, anonymised or aggregated data is not regulated by the Act.

The notion of accountability was introduced in the OECD's guidelines [22], and has been actively studied in the recent years in connection with the European personal data protection regulations [7, 15]. The goal of accountability is to ensure that data controllers[1] are be able to demonstrate compliance with the internationally accepted data protection rules, which enables a company to protect themselves in case of dispute. The most notable rules include the Article 29 working party captures most critical aspects of accountability (demonstrating how responsibility is

[1]The entities collecting personal data, based on the European terminology.

practiced and making verifiable) [7] and the European Commission Regulations for General Data Protection Regulation [4, 15].

In technical terms accountability is closely linked with (secure) log design, namely, every action performed in a system should be traceable and retrievable via logs or records. End-to-end accountability in this context captures the ability to check whether the implemented policies governing data manipulation and inference were fully complied [25] with respect to the whole data life cycle, namely: data collection, data usage, data storage, data deletion, data sharing, and data forwarding accountabilities.

On the other hand, privacy by design will become a legal obligation for companies (at least in the EU community) once the Data Protection Regulation [4,15] gets adopted. Indeed, the fact that the European Parliament has launched a reform on the data protection regulation (partly due to the "Snowden incident") motivates companies to reconsider their privacy policies and architecture. Initiatives on strengthening the data protection and privacy regulations have been launched by the European Union after the Edward Snowden incident. According to the BBC news [5] in 2014, the new data protection proposals include a clause to prevent European data being shared with another country in response to Edward Snowden's allegations, as well as providing rights and means for citizens to erase their personal data. In addition, the proposals also attempt to limit companies from peforming user profiling and demanding appropriate consents before any personal data collection.

There are popular services in the market such as social networks (e.g., Facebook, Twitter, Google+, LinkedIn) or cloud services (Dropbox, Google Drive, One Drive, etc.). The major problem with these services, however, is that they often neglect the importance of user privacy and their right for taking control over their (personal) data. The main reason perhaps because of the potential business value of the collected data, which decreases the motivation of companies on implementing a comprehensive privacy and accountability policies, as well as support the users with the possibility of full control over their data. Although distributed social networks such as Diaspora [1] or client-side encryption based cloud services such as Tresorit [2] and Wuala [3] are proposed to fill this gap, they only address privacy and accountability issues in an ad-hoc manner.

The focus of this paper is not a legal study on personal data protection, but rather a technical (mathematical) "privacy respected" system design approach. Specifically, we investigate and propose a semi-formal approach to assist system designers, by enabling a systematic and mathematically sound design methodology of privacy policies and the corresponding privacy architectures.

# 2 Motivation and Contributions

In the sequel, we discuss about the motivation and provide the main contributions of this paper. In particular, Section 2.1 reviews some recent privacy breach incidents, while the main contributions can be found in Section 2.2.

## 2.1 Motivation

Although popular systems and online services are aware of the importance of personal data protection, privacy and accountability requirements, their implemented solutions are often ad-hoc, mainly for patching the gaps (perhaps after some incidents [12, 19, 20, 23, 24, 26]) and not fully comply with the current regulations, which is confirmed by the recent privacy violation cases discussed below.

Facebook has been reported to (allegedly) violating privacy rights of its users several times. For instance, on January 2014, The CNET and Bloomberg news portals have reported that the social network company was being sued by its users for intercepting private messages without consent, to mine the data for its own profit [19, 20]. In particular, Facebook was accussed of scanning private messages with URLs in them, which violates the Electronic Communications Privacy Act.

On March 2015, The Guardian UK portal reported [23] that law researchers at the University of Leuven claimed, based on their paper [9], that Facebook tracks computers of users without their consent, whether they are logged in to Facebook or not, and even if they are not registered users of the site. The tracking method is based on the "social button" plugins embedded in third party webpages. These activities violate the European privacy law, which require prior consent before issuing a cookie or performing tracking. As a result of this investigation, the Belgian privacy commission planned taking Facebook to court, reported by The Gurdian in June 2015 [24].

Google has been reported to face 15 million Euros fines by Dutch authorities after it has been found to violate the privacy laws. Namely, Google was accussed with taking users' private information such as browsing history and location data to target them with customised ads [12]. The authority ordered the company to inform users of its actions.

A recent privacy violation problem linked to Google Photos was reported on the Nashville Business Journal in July 2015 [13]. According to the report, Google Photos upload users photo to the cloud even if they do not want to. Users was complaining that their photos are uploaded to the cloud after the application has been uninstalled, or worst, this happens even when Google Drive and Google Plus are disabled. The metadata of the photos such as location information are also stored.

Finally, when talking about privacy issue, we cannot pass by the famous Snowden incident two years ago, when according to the leaked slides [17], the users data stored in online services of Microsoft, Yahoo, Google, Facebook, PalTalk, AOL, Skype, YouTube, and Apple, along with the widely used cloud service Dropbox, has been retrieved by governmental authorities.

Although it might be the case that these privacy violation incidents are the result of "intentional" neglegency due to the business model of the companies, however, from the technical perspective, to the best of our knowledge, there is not any formal model or systematic method to design privacy policies and architectures, as well as checking the compliance of existing services with the data protection rules. The main advantage of using formal or semi-formal approaches during the system design is that the compliance with the regulations can be confirmed based on mathematical methods, unlike informal reasoning.

## 2.2 Contributions

Addressing the problems discussed in Section 2.1, the goal of this paper is to propose a systematic design method of privacy policies as well as a automated generation of privacy architectures from policies, based on the data protection regulations. The first step in this procedure is to formulate high-level and informal privacy rules as semi-formal policies. To this end, we propose a semi-formal policy language.

We emphasize that although our policy languague variant is inspired by the work of Butin et al. [10], it is more generic than the one in [10]. For instance, while in [10] the policy is static, meaning that the elements do not change, our policy languague includes permission updates on data handling. In addition, our language covers a broader set of parameters to capture more fine-grained data control policies.

The second step is a systematic derivation of privacy architectures from the defined privacy policies. For this purpose, we propose a semi-formal privacy language for architectures, and the mapping procedure from the policy level to the architecture level. Again, our language for architectures is inspired by the work of Antignac et al. [6], but it addresses data control and accountability issues, which is not the case in [6]. We will discuss the differences in more details in the Section 3. All of the aforementioned design steps are shown in the first row of the Fig. 1.

The second row of the Fig. 1 captures the conformance verification approaches. Namely, given an existing services like Facebook or Dropbox, we first specify their privacy policies and privacy architectures based on the two proposed languages, and then comparing the two policies as well as two architectures.




Figure 1: An overview of the contributions of this paper.

# 3 Related Works

Formal approaches for reasoning about accountability and data control requirements are less investigated so far. Nevertheless, some attempts on formalizing privacy and accountability policies and privacy architectures have been made, such as in [10] and [6]. In [10], a formal privacy policy language was proposed that defines, for each type of personal data, authorised purposes, deletion delays, request completion delays, admissible contexts and data forwarding policies. Trace compliance properties were defined with respect to data handling events and elements of these privacy policies. The correctness properties relating personal data handling events and system events was also formalized. While the idea is nice, the presented policy language considers limited aspect of accountability and lacks possibilities to reason about data control options for system users. For instance, in [10] there is no possibility to specify the storage mode of the data, and the data control possibilities such as who can have, see or perform actions on certain data. To fill this gap, we extend the policy proposed in [10] with additional syntax and semantics elements, along with the corresponding compliance rules. As a result, our proposed policy is more generic and fine-grained than the one in [10], and it is capable of modelling data control and accountability requirements in more complex online services such as Facebook or Dropbox.

In this paper, we address a system design methodology that takes into account a comprehensive set of end-to-end accountability and data control requirements, which to the best of our knowledge has not been proposed yet in the previous works. From the data controller's (DC) perspective, end-to-end accountability lifecycle refers to the policies defined by the DC at each stage of the data life cycle [11], namely, (i) data collection, (ii) data storage, (iii) data usage, (iv) data forwarding/sharing, and (v) data deletion.

The *data collection accountability* typically involves user consent for the data collection, declaring the purposes of the data collected during the registration procedure, and the retention period of certain collected data. The *data storage accountability* includes the storage mode of the collected data, such as encrypted or clear form, as well as centralized or decentralized storage. The *data usage accountability* specifies the authorized usage purposes of the personal data. The *data deletion accountability* specifies the deletion delay as well as the deletion mode such as manual or automated deletion. Manual deletion refers to the case when the deletion is initiated by a user, e.g., by pressing a button, while in the second case the deletion is performed by the service provider or data controller after a certain delay. Finally, the *data forwarding/sharing accountability* includes the policy specifying to whom the data can be forwarded or shared by the service provider or data controller [11].

Our proposed high-level policies can be seen as policies composed of smaller policies that capture each of the end-to-end accountability policy above. In addition, the policies also keep track of the permission groups capturing who can have certain data or perform given actions on it.

In [6], the authors addressed the problem of privacy-by-design at the architecture level and proposed a formal approach that facilitate systematic architecture design. In particular, they

provided the idea of the architecture language and logic, a dedicated variant of epistemic logics [12], to deal with different aspects of privacy. Basically, an architecture is defined as a set of architecture relations, which capture the computation and communication abilities of each component. For instance, a relation compute$_i(x = t)$ specifies that a component $C_i$ can compute a value $t$ for the variable $x$. The proposed language mainly focuses on the computation and integrity verification aspects of data. Unlike in [6], our proposed language focuses primary on the end-to-end accountability and data control aspects, rather than the data integrity perspective.

Generally speaking, system architecture is the conceptual model that defines the high-level structure and behavior of a system [18]. A system architecture usually comprise system components as well as interfaces among the system's components or subsystems, and the interface between the system and its environment, such as the user. In our paper, similar to [6], we adopt the architecture definition given in [8], namely: "the architecture of a system is the set of structures needed to reason about the system, which comprise software and hardware elements, relations among them and properties of both." Our architecture language is based on the concept of the one in [6], however, it includes different syntax and semantics elements for capturing accountability and data control. The proposed architecture language and policy language are closely related to each other making it feasible to derive the corresponding architecture from a defined policy.

# 4 $\mathcal{P}_{DC}$ : A Policy Language for Data Control

We propose a high-level privacy policy language (called $\mathcal{P}_{DC}$) to specify and reason about data control and accountability requirements. The data subjects in our model are system users whose personal data has been collected or input to the system by some entity, who can be either the data subject or someone else (including the service provider). For instance, a user *or* can post some photo $X$ of a user *tar*, as well as a service provider can collect some information $X$ of a user during the registration. The privacy policies capture the end-to-end accountability and data control requirements defined in a system. In the following, we discuss the notation concept of the privacy policies and the meaning of their elements.

## 4.1 Policy Syntax

We assume four finite sets of activities defined in a system: $\mathbb{A}1 = \{act1^1, \ldots, act1^n\}$, and $\mathbb{UA}1 = \{unact1^1, \ldots, unact1^n\}$, $\mathbb{A}2 = \{act2^1, \ldots, act2^m\}$, and $\mathbb{UA}2 = \{unact2^1, \ldots, unact2^m\}$. Each $act1 \in \mathbb{A}1$ represents an action performed by an entity *or* on some data *dt*, and its revocation counterpart $unact1 \in \mathbb{UA}1$. In addition, each $act2 \in \mathbb{A}2$ captures an action performed by an entity *or* with some other entity *tar* (or group of entities) on a data *dt*, and its revocation counterpart $unact2 \in \mathbb{UA}2$. An example of *act1* would be *like* in Facebook, while the *act2* could be *share*. These *act1* and *act2* actions are service specific, meaning that they are different, for example, in case of Facebook or Dropbox. Furthermore, our language includes the pre-defined actions *own*, *store*, *use*, *deletereq*, *delete*, *group*, and *ungroup*, which are common in most systems.

**Definition 1** *(Data Control Policy). The syntax of the data control policies are defined as tuples:*

$$Pol_{DT} = Purp \times Del \times W_{st} \times H_{st} \times ActPol \times HasPol.$$

Each policy is defined on each (personal) data *dt*, capturing the data control settings on this data. A data *dt* is defined as the tuple (*ow*, *ds*, $\theta$, *id*, *actby*), where *ow* is the onwer of the data who inputs this data into the system[2], *ds* specifies a set of data subjects included in this data, $\theta$ is the type and *id* a unique identifier of the data, while *actby* is a tuple of ($\mathcal{S}^{by}_{act^1}, \ldots, \mathcal{S}^{by}_{act^k}, \mathcal{S}^{been}_{act^n}, \ldots, \mathcal{S}^{been}_{act^m}$). $\mathcal{S}^{by}_{act^i}$ denoting the set of users who have performed $act^i$ on *dt* during the system run,

[2]In our model, for each data there is only one *ow* who inputs this data to the system, the user who obtain the data during the system run is not defined as *ow*.

while $\mathcal{S}^{been}_{act^i}$ the set of users with whom action $act^i$ (either *act1* or *act2*) has been performed on this data. We note that in our model the tuple ($ow$, $ds$, $\theta$, $id$) is fixed, while *actby* can be changed during the system run. Intuitively, this means that the content of the data and its metadata will not change, but the set of users who are involved in activities performed on the data.

Specifically, in $\pi_{dt} \in Pol_{DT}$, where $\pi_{dt} = (ap, dm, wh, ho, acp, has)$, $ap$ is the set of authorized purposes of data usage, $dm$ defines the set of pairs of (*deletion mode*, *deletion delay*), which can be either (*man*, *dd*) or (*aut*, *dd*). In (*man*, *dd*), *man* refers to a manual deletion initiated by a user, while *dd* represents the delay for the deletion after the initiation (e.g., when a user presses a delete button). In (*aut*, *dd*), *aut* refers to automated deletion with the delay *dd*. Automated deletion refers to the worst case retention delay for personal data, for instance, the deletion delay after a user has unregistered from the system. $wh$ is a set of places where the data $dt$ is stored, for instance, in a client computer or in the service provider's servers, namely, $wh = \{clientloc, sploc\}$. $ho$ is the set of forms in which the data $dt$ is stored, for example, in encrypted or plaintext forms, $ho = \{enc, plain\}$. $acp$ is the set of policies specifying which entities can do which kind of actions/operations on a given data $dt$. Each action policy is a tuple of the entities who have been granted permission (either by the service provider by default, or by a user) to do certain actions on $dt$, namely: $acp = (\mathcal{G}^{can}_{act^1}, \ldots \mathcal{G}^{can}_{act^k})$, where $\mathcal{G}^{can}_{act^i}$ denotes the sets of the users who are allowed to perform action $act^i$ (either *act1* or *act2*).

Finally, $has$ is the set of entities who are allowed (either by the service provider by default, or by a user) to have $dt$ after a certain action $act$ has been performed by someone (either the service provider or a user) on this data. The $has$ part of the policy $\pi_{dt}$ is a tuple of permission groups, $has = (\mathcal{G}^{by}_{has}(\mathcal{S}^{by}_{act^1}), \ldots, \mathcal{G}^{by}_{has}(\mathcal{S}^{by}_{act^k}), \mathcal{G}^{been}_{has}(\mathcal{S}^{been}_{act^i}), \ldots, \mathcal{G}^{been}_{has}(\mathcal{S}^{been}_{act^j}), \mathcal{G}^{group}_{has})$. Namely, for each entity $or \in \mathcal{S}^{by}_{act}$, $\mathcal{G}^{by}_{has}(or)$ returns the set of entities who can have $dt$ as a result of an action $act$, performed by $or$. For each $or \in \mathcal{S}^{been}_{act}$, $\mathcal{G}^{been}_{has}(\mathcal{S}^{been}_{act})$ returns the set of entities who can have $dt$ as a result of an action $act$ performed by entity $or$ with entity $tar$ (e.g., $act$ could be *share* or *tag*). Eventually, $\mathcal{G}^{group}_{has}$ includes the entities who can have $dt$ as a result of a *group* action, meaning the addition of some user to a group (e.g., add friends).

## 4.2 Policies Semantics

The *semantics* of this high-level policy is defined based on a set of abstract events and compliant traces corresponding to a system. Each abstract event captures an action, or a high-level event happens during the system run. These events are abstract, because they specify high-level actions happen during the system operation, ingoring the low-level system internals such as writting to a memory space (i.e., system log level). Events are defined by tuples starting with an event name capturing the event happens with $dt$, followed by the time of the event, then the data involved in the event, and ends with the current policy of $dt$.

Given the activity sets $\mathbb{A}1$, $\mathbb{A}2$, $\mathbb{AU}1$, $\mathbb{AU}2$ defined in the system, for each data $dt$ defined with $ow$, $ds$, $\theta$, $id$, and $\pi_{dt}$ the function $\mathbb{EV}(\mathbb{A}1, \mathbb{A}2, \mathbb{AU}1, \mathbb{AU}2, ow, ds, \theta, id, \pi_{dt})$ returns the following possible events corresponding to $dt$:

***Ev1*:** $(own, t, or, dt, \pi_{dt})$

***Ev2*:** $(store, t, dt, \pi_{dt})$

***Ev3*:** $(use, t, dt, purposes)$

***Ev4*:** $(deletereq, t, or, dt, \pi_{dt})$

***Ev5*:** $(delete, t, dt)$

***Ev6*:** $(groupact, t, or, tar, dt, \pi_{dt}.acp.\mathcal{G}^{can}_{act})$, $\forall\ act \in \mathbb{A}1 \cup \mathbb{A}2 \cup \mathbb{AU}1 \cup \mathbb{AU}2$.

***Ev7*:** $(ungroupact, t, or, tar, dt, \pi_{dt}.acp.\mathcal{G}^{can}_{act})$ $\forall\ act \in \mathbb{A}1 \cup \mathbb{A}2 \cup \mathbb{AU}1 \cup \mathbb{AU}2$.

***Ev8*:** $(grouphas, t, or, tar, dt, \pi_{dt}.has.\mathcal{G}^{group}_{has})$

***Ev9*:** $(ungrouphas,\ t,\ or,\ tar,\ dt,\ \pi_{dt}.has.\mathcal{G}_{has}^{group})$

***Ev10*:** $(act1,\ t,\ or,\ dt,\ \pi_{dt}),\ \forall\ act1 \in \mathbb{A}1$

***Ev11*:** $(unact1,\ t,\ or,\ dt,\ \pi_{dt}),\ \forall\ unact1 \in \mathbb{AU}1$

***Ev12*:** $(act2,\ t,\ or,\ tar,\ dt,\ \pi_{dt}),\ \forall\ act2 \in \mathbb{A}2$

***Ev13*:** $(unact2,\ t,\ or,\ tar,\ dt,\ \pi_{dt}),\ \forall\ unact2 \in \mathbb{AU}2$

In the sequel, we refer to each element $e$ of a tuple *tup* by *tup.e*, for example, we can refer to *ap* in $\pi_{dt}$ by $\pi_{dt}.ap$. Event *own* captures the fact that the data *dt* is initially owned (possessed) by *or* with the policy $\pi_{dt}$. Event *store* specifies that the data *dt* is stored based on the method specified in $\pi_{dt}.wh$ and $\pi_{dt}.ho$ at time *t*. In *deletereq*, a request is received by the service provider (e.g., user presses the delete button in Facebook) from user *or* at time *t* to delete the data *dt*. Note that *deletereq* only takes place when $\pi_{dt}.dm = (man,\ dd)$. The event *delete* captures the fact that the data *dt* was deleted at time *t*. The events *groupact* and *ungroupact* capture the moment when the entity *or* adds (removes) the entity *tar* to (from) the set $\mathcal{G}_{act}^{can}$ in $\pi_{dt}$. In other words, these events specify the permission granted (revoked) by *or* to *tar* to perform action *act* on the data *dt*. Similarly, events *grouphas* and *ungrouphas* capture the moment when the entity *or* adds (removes) *tar* to (from) the set $\mathcal{G}_{has}^{group}$ in $\pi_{dt}$. Event *use* defines the authorized purposes of the data usage. For the events *act1* and *unact1*, entity *or* performs action *act1* and *unact1*, respectively, on the data *dt*. Finally, events *act2* and *unact2* capture the events happenning at time *t* in which *act2* and *unact2* have been performed on *dt*, respectively, by *or* with *tar*, besides the policy $\pi_{dt}$. In case of *Ev6*, *Ev7*, and *Ev10-Ev13* the number of events depends on the size of the sets $\mathbb{A}1$, $\mathbb{A}2$, $\mathbb{AU}1$, and $\mathbb{AU}2$.

**Definition 2** (*Trace*). *A trace $\tau$ is a sequence of abstract events.*

Traces capture the current operation of a system, which can be either compliant or non-compliant with the accountability and data control requirements. In order to define the notion of compliant traces, we need to introduce first the notion of abstract states.

**Definition 3** (*Abstract state*). *The abstract state of a system is a function* $\sum : (User \times User \times Type \times ID) \rightarrow (Time \times Value \times ActBy \times Policy \times Has)$.

The abstract state associated with the data of an owner *ow* with ID *id* and type $\theta$ about the data subject *ds* is composed of a timestamp, the current value of the data, the set of actions performed by someone on this data (*ActBy*), the current policy attached to this data, and a set of users who have this data at this time. Specifically:

$$(ow,\ ds,\ \theta,\ id) \rightarrow (t,\ v,\ actby,\ \pi_{dt},\ \mathcal{H}_{has})$$

The notation $\sum[(ow,\ ds,\ \theta,\ id) \rightarrow (t,\ v,\ actby,\ \pi_{dt},\ \mathcal{H}_{has})]$ captures a state update, and is used to denote a state $\sum'$ similar to $\sum$ except that $\sum'(ow,\ ds,\ \theta,\ id) = (t,\ v,\ actby,\ \pi_{dt},\ \mathcal{H}_{has})$. The semantics of an event at a given position $j$ in a trace is specified by the function $S_A$: $(Event \times N) \rightarrow AbstractState \rightarrow AbstractState$. Specifically, we have:

1. $S_A((own,\ t,\ or,\ dt,\ \pi_{dt})),\ j)\sum$
   $= \sum[(ow,\ ds,\ \theta,\ id) \rightarrow (t,\ v,\ actby,\ \pi_{dt},\ \mathcal{H}_{has} \cup \{or\})]$

2. $S_A((store,\ t,\ dt,\ \pi_{dt}),\ j)\sum$
   $= \sum[(ow,\ ds,\ \theta,\ id) \rightarrow (t,\ v,\ actby,\ \pi_{dt},\ \mathcal{H}_{has} \cup \{\text{sp}\})]$
   if $((plain,\ \text{-}) \in \pi_{dt}.ho) \wedge (sploc \in \pi_{dt}.wh)$, *or*
   $((enc,\ spkey) \in \pi_{dt}.ho) \wedge (sploc \in \pi_{dt}.wh)$
   $= \sum$, else.

3. $S_A((deletereq,\ t,\ or,\ dt,\ \pi_{dt}),\ j)\sum = \sum$, if $(man,\ dd) \in \pi_{dt}.dm$

4. $S_A((delete,\ t,\ dt)\ ,\ j)\sum = \sum[(ow,\ ds,\ \theta,\ id) \rightarrow \perp]$

5. $S_A((groupact,\ t,\ or,\ tar,\ dt,\ \pi_{dt}.acp.\mathcal{G}^{can}_{act}),\ j)\sum$
$= \sum[(ow,\ ds,\ \theta,\ id) \rightarrow (t,\ v,\ actby,\ \pi_{dt}[\pi_{dt}.acp.\mathcal{G}^{can}_{act} \cup \{tar\}],\ \mathcal{H}_{has} \cup \{tar\})]$

6. $S_A((ungroupact,\ t,\ or,\ tar,\ dt,\ \pi_{dt}.acp.\mathcal{G}^{can}_{act}),\ j)\sum$
$= \sum[(ow,\ ds,\ \theta,\ id) \rightarrow (t,\ v,\ actby,\ \pi_{dt}[\pi_{dt}.acp.\mathcal{G}^{can}_{act} \setminus \{tar\}],\ \mathcal{H}_{has} \setminus \{tar\})]$

7. $S_A((grouphas,\ t,\ or,\ tar,\ dt,\ \pi_{dt}.has.\mathcal{G}^{group}_{has}),\ j)\sum$
$= \sum[(ow,\ ds,\ \theta,\ id) \rightarrow (t,\ v,\ actby,\ \pi_{dt}[\pi_{dt}.acp.\mathcal{G}^{group}_{has} \cup \{tar\}],\ \mathcal{H}_{has} \cup \{tar\})]$

8. $S_A((ungrouphas,\ t,\ or,\ tar,\ dt,\ \pi_{dt}.has.\mathcal{G}^{group}_{has}),\ j)\sum$
$= \sum[(ow,\ ds,\ \theta,\ id) \rightarrow (t,\ v,\ actby,\ \pi_{dt}[\pi_{dt}.has.\mathcal{G}^{group}_{has} \setminus \{tar\}],\ \mathcal{H}_{has} \setminus \{tar\})]$

9. $S_A((act1,\ t,\ or,\ dt,\ \pi_{dt}),\ j)\sum$
$= \sum[(ow,\ ds,\ \theta,\ id) \rightarrow (t,\ v,\ actby[\mathcal{S}^{by}_{act1} \cup \{or\}],\ \pi_{dt},\ \mathcal{H}_{has} \cup \pi_{dt}.has.\mathcal{G}^{by}_{has}(or))]$
if $(or \in \pi_{dt}.acp.\mathcal{G}^{can}_{act1})$
$= \sum$, else.

10. $S_A((unact1,\ t,\ or,\ dt,\ \pi_{dt}),\ j)\sum$
$= \sum[(ow,\ ds,\ \theta,\ id) \rightarrow (t,\ v,\ actby[\mathcal{S}^{by}_{act1} \setminus \{or\}],\ \pi_{dt},\ \mathcal{H}_{has} \setminus \pi_{dt}.has.\mathcal{G}^{by}_{has}(or))]$
if $(or \in \pi_{dt}.acp.\mathcal{G}^{can}_{unact1})$
$= \sum$, else.

11. $S_A((act2,\ t,\ or,\ tar,\ dt,\ \pi_{dt}),\ j)\sum$
$= \sum[(ow,\ ds,\ \theta,\ id) \rightarrow (t,\ v,\ actby[\mathcal{S}^{by}_{act2} \cup \{or\},\ \mathcal{S}^{been}_{act2} \cup \{tar\}\}],\ \pi_{dt},\ \mathcal{H}_{has} \cup$
$\pi_{dt}.has.\mathcal{G}^{by}_{has}(or) \cap \pi_{dt}.has.\mathcal{G}^{been}_{has}(tar))]$
if $(or \in \pi_{dt}.acp.\mathcal{G}^{can}_{act2})$
$= \sum$, else.

12. $S_A((unact2,\ t,\ or,\ tar,\ dt,\ \pi_{dt}),\ j)\sum$
$= \sum[(ow,\ ds,\ \theta,\ id) \rightarrow (t,\ v,\ actby[\mathcal{S}^{by}_{act2} \setminus \{or\},\ \mathcal{S}^{been}_{act2} \setminus \{tar\}\}],\ \pi_{dt},\ \mathcal{H}_{has} \setminus$
$\pi_{dt}.has.\mathcal{G}^{by}_{has}(or) \cap \pi_{dt}.has.\mathcal{G}^{been}_{has}(tar))]$
if $(or \in \pi_{dt}.acp.\mathcal{G}^{can}_{unact2})$
$= \sum$, else.

Since the event *use* does not change the current state, for the sake of simplicity, we left it out from the above list. As a result of event *own* the owner of the data $dt$ is added to the set $\mathcal{H}_{has}$. Event $\mathcal{H}_{has}$ adds the service provider sp to $\mathcal{H}_{has}$ either in case $dt$ is stored as plaintext at the service provider location or encrypted with the service provider's key. Otherwise, the state is unchanged. Event *deletereq* does not change the current state, however, it only takes place when the deletion policy allows manual deletion initiated by users. Event *delete* replaces the current state to the undefined state $\perp$. Events *groupact* (*grouphas*) add *tar* to $\mathcal{H}_{has}$ and the policy is updated with the policy where $act.\mathcal{G}^{can}_{act}$ ($has.\mathcal{G}^{group}_{act}$) is extended with *tar*, this is denoted by $\pi_{dt}[\pi_{dt}.acp.\mathcal{G}^{can}_{act} \cup \{tar\}]$. Their *ungroupact* and *ungrouphas* counterparts have a reverse impact on the state and policy. In point 9, if *or* is allowed to perform *act1* on $dt$, then event *act1* results in adding *or* to every occurrence of set $\mathcal{S}^{by}_{act1}$ in $\pi_{dt}$, as well as extending $\mathcal{H}_{has}$ with $\pi_{dt}.has.\mathcal{G}^{by}_{has}(or)$. Similar to *act1*, event *act2* adds *or* to $\mathcal{S}^{by}_{act2}$ and also adds *tar* to every occurrence of $\mathcal{S}^{been}_{act2}$ in $\pi_{dt}$. In addition, the intersection $\pi_{dt}has.\mathcal{G}^{by}_{has}(or) \cap \pi_{dt}has.\mathcal{G}^{been}_{has}(tar)$ is added to $\mathcal{H}_{has}$. Intuitively, as a

result of *act2* on data *dt*, $\mathcal{H}_{has}$ is extended with the set of entities who can have *dt* after *act2* is performed by *or* on it, involving *tar* as a partner in some form (e.g., tagging *tar* in *dt*, or sharing *dt* with *tar*). Again, their *unact1* and *unact2* counterparts have a reverse impact on the state and policy.

### 4.3 Trace Compliance

Compliance for traces of events is defined to capture the data control and accountability respected operation of the system. We define five most relevant trace compliance rules $C_1$ - $C_5$, which are concerning directly with the accountability and data control properties. The high-level interpretation of each rule is as follows:

- $C_1$: A data $dt = (ow, ds, \theta, id, \dots)$ is only used for purposes defined in the corresponding policy.
- $C_2$: If the policy forbids user *or* to perform an action $*$, where $* \in \{act1, unact1, act2, unact2, delete\}$, on the data $dt = (ow, ds, \theta, id, \dots)$, then it cannot perform this action.
- $C_3$: If a user *tar* has a data $dt = (ow, ds, \theta, id, \dots)$, then there can be three cases: (i) $tar = ow$, namely, *tar* initially owns and inputs this data to the system; or (ii) it is a consequence of an action from $\mathbb{A}1$, or (iii) it is a consequence of an action from $\mathbb{A}2$ performed on this data.
- $C_4$: If the service provider *sp* has a data $dt = (ow, ds, \theta, id, \pi_{dt}, \dots)$, then either (i) $((plain, \text{-}) \in \pi_{dt}.ho) \wedge (sploc \in \pi_{dt}.wh)$ or (ii) $((enc, spkey) \in \pi_{dt}.ho) \wedge (sploc \in \pi_{dt}.wh)$.
- $C_5$: The deletion of a data $dt = (ow, ds, \theta, id, \dots)$ must happen within the specified deletion delay, *dm*, after the deletion request has been initiated.

Before formalizing these compliance rules in Fig. 2, we provide some auxiliary definitions. The current state after the execution of a trace $\tau = [ev_1, \dots, ev_n]$ is defined as $F_A(\tau, 1)\sum_0$ with $\forall$ $(ow, ds\ \theta, id)$: $\sum_0(ow, ds\ \theta, id) = \perp$, and

- $F_A([\,], n)\sum = \sum$.
- $F_A([ev_1, \dots, ev_m], n)\sum = F_A([ev_2, \dots, ev_m], n+1)(\mathcal{S}_A(ev_1, n)\sum)$

where, $State_A(\tau, i) = F_A(\tau_{|i}, 1)\sum_0$ with $\tau_{|i} = \tau_1 \dots \tau_i$ representing the prefix of length $i$ of $\tau$.

In Fig. 2, rule $C_1$ says that if the data *dt* is used for some *purposes* at the i-th event in a trace, and the policy at the $(i-1)$th state is $\pi_{dt}$, then *purposes* must be subset of $\pi_{dt}.ap$. $C_2$ captures that if *or* performed *act* on *dt* at the i-th event, and the policy at the $(i-1)$th state is $\pi_{dt}$, then *or* must has been permitted to perform this action, namely, $or \in \pi_{dt}.act.\mathcal{G}_*^{can}$. Rule $C_3$ says that if *tar* has data *dt* at the i-th state, then there can be three cases: (i) *tar* is the same as *ow*, (ii)-(iii) at a previous *k*-th event (takes place at time $t'$) *tar* has been added to $\mathcal{H}_{has}$ as a result of *act1* and *act2*, respectively. $C_4$ captures that if at the i-th state if sp $\in \mathcal{H}_{has}$, then either *dt* is stored at the service provider side. Finally, $C_5$ specifies the fact that the deletion must happens within *dd* delay after *deletereq* has been launched. Trace compliance is defined with respect to the five rules above:

**Definition 4 (Trace compliance)** *A trace $\tau$ is compliant if it satisfies all of the properties $C_1, \dots, C_5$.*

- $C_1 : \tau_i = (use, t, dt, purposes) \wedge State_A(\tau, i-1)(ow, ds, \theta, id) = (t, v, actby, \pi_{dt}, \mathcal{H}_{has}) \Longrightarrow purposes \subseteq \pi_{dt}.ap$
- $C_2 : \tau_i = (*, t, or, tar, dt, \pi_{dt}) \wedge State_A(\tau, i-1)(ow, ds, \theta, id) = (t, v, actby, \pi_{dt}, \mathcal{H}_{has}) \Longrightarrow or \in \pi_{dt}.act.\mathcal{G}^{can}_{*}$
- $C_3 : State_A(\tau, i)(ow, ds, \theta, id) = (t, v, actby, \pi_{dt}, \mathcal{H}_{has}) \wedge tar \in \mathcal{H}_{has} \Longrightarrow$
  $(i)\ tar = ow \vee$
  $(ii)\ \exists\ k \mid \exists\ t' \mid \exists\ or \mid State_A(\tau, k)(ow, ds, \theta, id) = (t', actby[\mathcal{S}^{by}_{act1} \cup \{or\}], \pi_{dt}, \mathcal{H}_{has} \cup \{tar\}] \wedge (t' < t) \vee$
  $(iii)\ \exists\ k \mid \exists\ t' \mid \exists\ or \mid \exists\ tar' \mid State_A(\tau, k)(ow, ds, \theta, id) = (t', actby[\mathcal{S}^{by}_{act2} \cup \{or\}, \mathcal{S}^{been}_{act2} \cup \{tar'\}], \pi_{dt}, \mathcal{H}_{has} \cup \{tar\}] \wedge (t' < t)$.
- $C_4 : State_A(\tau, i)(ow, ds, \theta, id) = (t, v, actby, \pi_{dt}, \mathcal{H}_{has}) \wedge sp \in \mathcal{H}_{has} \Longrightarrow$ (i) $(plain, \text{-}) \in \pi_{dt}.ho) \wedge (sploc \in \pi_{dt}.wh)$, or (ii) $((enc, spkey) \in \pi_{dt}.ho) \wedge (sploc \in \pi_{dt}.wh)$.
- $C_5 : \tau_i = (deletereq, t', or, dt, \pi_{dt}) \wedge State_A(\tau, i-1)\ (ow, ds, \theta, id) = (t, v, actby, \pi_{dt}, \mathcal{H}_{has}) \Longrightarrow \exists\ k \mid \exists\ t'' \mid \tau_k = (delete, t'', dt) \wedge (t' < t'' \leq t' + \pi_{dt}.dd)$

Figure 2: Trace compliance rules

# 5 $\mathcal{A}_{DC}$ : An Architecture Language for Data Control

In order to design and derive the architectures corresponding to the privacy policies defined with $\mathcal{P}_{DC}$, we propose an architecture language, $\mathcal{A}_{DC}$. $\mathcal{A}_{DC}$ follows a similar concept of the language introduced in [6], however, it has been modified accordingly for our purpose. Unlike the architecture language in [6], which mainly focuses on data computation and verification of the data integrity, $\mathcal{A}_{DC}$ primary addresses the end-to-end accountability and data control aspects. Hence, $\mathcal{A}_{DC}$ defines different syntax and semantics elements for capturing the end-to-end accountability and data control requirements.

## 5.1 Architectures Syntax

Assuming a finite $m$ users in the system, we define the set of system users:

$$Users ::= U_i, \text{ where } i \in \{1, \ldots, m\}.$$

Users are uniquely identified based on their indices. Terms model any data defined in the system (e.g. in case of the social networks, data can be posts, notes, photos and basic information about the users. Term $T$ is defined by

$$T ::= X^{ow,ds}_{id} \mid X_{key} \mid F(X^{ow_1,ds_1}_{id_1}, \ldots, X^{ow_r,ds_r}_{id_r}) \mid D^{ow,ds}_{id}$$

$$id ::= xk \mid ck$$

$$\text{TYPE}(T) ::= \theta$$

We assume a finite set of data subjects ($ds \in \mathcal{DS}$), a finite set of data IDs ($id \in \mathcal{ID}$), and a finite set of types ($\theta \in \mathcal{TY}$).

$D^{ow,ds}_{id}$ represents data constants of different categories (e.g., certain basic information, photos, posts, notes, messages, etc.). For each user $U_i$ we define a finite set of variables $\mathcal{V}_i = \{X^{ow,ds}_{id}\}$ that it owns. Variables represent any kind of data (supported by a service provider), such as the users'

basic information, photos, videos, posts, etc. $id$ can be an index variable $xk$ or an index constant $ck$, such that any index can be bound to $xk$. Variables can be given specific values, denoted by $V \in Val$ ($V$ covers all types of data constants). $F(X_{id_1}^{ow_1,ds_1}, \ldots, X_{id_r}^{ow_r,ds_r})$ is a function $F$ computed on the variables $X_{id_1}^{ow_1,ds_1}$, $\ldots$, $X_{id_r}^{ow_r,ds_r}$, where $F$ can be, for instance, encryption, hash, digital signature. We assume an implicit type system that defines a type $\theta$ for each term $T$.

For each defined data (variable) $X_{id}^{ow,ds}$ we let $\mathcal{Z}_{act}^{by}(X_{id}^{ow,ds})$ be a set of users who have performed an activity $act$ on $X_{id}^{ow,ds}$, while $\mathcal{Z}_{act}^{been}(X_{id}^{ow,ds})$ be a set of users who have been involved (e.g., tagged, mentioned, shared with) in the activity $act$ on data $X_{id}^{ow,ds}$. For each user $U_i$ we define the following sets of users based on their permissions granted by $U_i$:

- $\mathcal{G}_{act}^{can}(U_i,\ X_{id}^{ow,ds})$ returns the set of users who are allowed by $U_i$ to perform $act$ on a data $X_{id}^{ow,ds}$.
- $\mathcal{G}_{has}^{by}(U_i,\ \mathcal{Z}_{act}^{by}(X_{id}^{ow,ds}),\ X_{id}^{ow,ds})$ captures the permission granted by $U_i$, and returns the set of users who can have the data $X_{id}^{ow,ds}$ after user $e$ has performed $act$ on $X_{id}^{ow,ds}$ (for each $e \in \mathcal{Z}_{act}^{by}(X_{id}^{ow,ds})$).
- $\mathcal{G}_{has}^{been}(U_i,\ \mathcal{Z}_{act}^{been}(X_{id}^{ow,ds}),\ X_{id}^{ow,ds})$ returns the set of users who can have the data $X_{id}^{ow,ds}$ after $act$ has been performed on user $e$ in a data $X_{id}^{ow,ds}$ (for each $e \in \mathcal{Z}_{act}^{been}(X_{id}^{ow,ds})$). Again, this permission is granted by $U_i$.
- $\mathcal{G}_{has}^{group}(X_{id}^{ow,ds})$ returns the set of users who can have $X_{id}^{ow,ds}$ as a result of the group/ungroup action.

The architecture $\mathcal{PA}$ is defined by a set of *activities* (relations) of users or services providers (denoted by $\{\mathcal{F}\}$). The formal definition of privacy architectures is given as follows:

---

$\mathcal{PA} ::= \{\mathcal{F}\}$

$\mathcal{F} ::= Own_i(X_{id}^{ow,ds}) \mid Posses_{sp}(X_{id}^{ow,ds}) \mid Posses_{sp}(F(X_{id_1}^{ow_1,ds_1}, \ldots, X_{id_r}^{ow_r,ds_r}))$
$\mid Posses_{sp}(X),\ X \in \{X_{id_1}^{ow_1,ds_1}, \ldots, X_{id_r}^{ow_r,ds_r}\}$
$\mid GroupAct_{i,tar}(\mathcal{G}') \mid UnGroupAct_{i,tar}(\mathcal{G}') \mid GroupHas_{i,tar}(\mathcal{G}')$
$\mid UnGroupHas_{i,tar}(\mathcal{G}') \mid DeleteReq_i(X_{id}^{ow,ds}) \mid Delete_{sp}(X_{id}^{ow,ds},\ dd)$
$\mid Act1_i(X_{id}^{ow,ds}) \mid UnAct1_i(X_{id}^{ow,ds}) \mid Act2_{i,tar}(X_{id}^{ow,ds}) \mid UnAct2_{i,tar}(X_{id}^{ow,ds})$

---

Activity $Own_i(X_{id}^{ow,ds})$ captures that $U_i$ owns the data variable $X_{id}^{ow,ds}$. Activities $Posses_{sp}(X_{id}^{ow,ds})$ and $Posses_{sp}(F(X_{id_1}^{ow_1,ds_1}, \ldots, X_{id_r}^{ow_r,ds_r}))$ say that the service provider possesses $X_{id}^{ow,ds}$ and $F(X_{id_1}^{ow_1,ds_1}, \ldots, X_{id_r}^{ow_r,ds_r})$, respectively. Activities $GroupAct_{i,tar}(\mathcal{G}')$, $GroupHas_{i,tar}(\mathcal{G}')$, $UnGroupAct_{i,tar}(\mathcal{G}')$ and $UnGroupHas_{i,tar}(\mathcal{G}')$ specifying that $U_i$ has the ability to perform group and ungroup user $tar$ in the system. Similarly, $Act1_i(X_{id}^{ow,ds})$, $UnAct1_i(X_{id}^{ow,ds})$, $Act2_{i,tar}(X_{id}^{ow,ds})$, and $UnAct2_{i,tar}(X_{id}^{ow,ds})$ captures the ability of $U_i$ to perform $Act1$, $Act2$, $UnAct1$ and $UnAct2$, respectively. Finally, $DeleteReq_i(X_{id}^{ow,ds})$ and $Delete_{sp}(X_{id}^{ow,ds},\ dd)$ saying that $U_i$ is able to send a delete request which will be executed by the service provider with a $dd$ delay.

## 5.2 Architectures Semantics

The semantics of an architecture is based on its set of compatible traces. A trace $\Gamma$ is a sequence of high-level events $Seq(\epsilon)$ occurring in the system as presented in the Table below.

---

$\Gamma ::= Seq(\epsilon)$

$\epsilon ::= own_{ow}(X_{id}^{ow,ds}{:}V,\, t) \mid possess_{sp}(X_{id}^{ow,ds}{:}V,\, t)$
$\quad \mid possess_{sp}(F(X_{id_1}^{ow_1,ds_1} : V_1, \ldots, X_{id_r}^{ow_r,ds_r} : V_r), t)$
$\quad \mid possess_{sp}(X : V,\, t),\ X \in \{X_{id_1}^{ow_1,ds_1}, \ldots,\ X_{id_r}^{ow_r,ds_r}\},\ V \in \{V_1, \ldots,\ V_r\}$
$\quad \mid groupact_{i,tar}(\mathcal{G}',\, t) \mid ungroupact_{i,tar}(\mathcal{G}',\, t) \mid grouphas_{i,tar}(\mathcal{G}',\, t)$
$\quad \mid ungrouphas_{i,tar}(\mathcal{G}',\, t) \mid deletereq_i(X_{id}^{ow,ds}{:}V,\, t) \mid delete_{sp}(X_{id}^{ow,ds}{:}V,\, t)$
$\quad \mid act1_i(X_{id}^{ow,ds}{:}V,\, t) \mid unact1_i(X_{id}^{ow,ds}{:}V,\, t) \mid act2_{i,tar}(X_{id}^{ow,ds}{:}V,\, t)$
$\quad \mid unact2_{i,tar}(X_{id}^{ow,ds}{:}V,\, t)$

---

Events can be seen as instantiated activities in the architecture with specific value bounded to variables at certain time. Events are given the same names as the corresponding activities but in lowercase letters. For example, event $own_{ow}(X_{id}^{ow,ds}{:}V,\, t)$ captures that $U_{ow}$ owns $X_{id}^{ow,ds}$ with value $V$ at time $t$. Event $possess_{sp}(X_{id}^{ow,ds}{:}V,\, t)$ saying that the service provider possesses the variable $X_{id}^{ow,ds}$ with value $V$ at time $t$. The other events can be interpreted in a similar way.

An architecture is said to be consistent if each variable can be initially possessed ($Possess_i$) by only a single user. In the sequel, only *consistent* architectures and consistent traces are considered. The semantics of events is defined based on *user states*:

$$State_\perp = (State_V \times State_P \times Time) \cup \{\perp\}$$
$$State_V = (Var \rightarrow Val_\perp)$$
$$State_P = \{\mathbb{G}^i\}$$

where $\mathbb{G}^i = \{\mathcal{G}_{act}^{can}(U_i, X_{id}^{ow,ds}),\ \mathcal{G}_{has}^{by}(U_i, \mathcal{Z}_{act}^{by}(X_{id}^{ow,ds}), X_{id}^{ow,ds}),$
$\mathcal{G}_{has}^{been}(U_i, \mathcal{Z}_{act}^{been}(X_{id}^{ow,ds}), X_{id}^{ow,ds}),\ \mathcal{G}_{has}^{group}(X_{id}^{ow,ds})\},$
$\forall\ act \in \mathbb{A}1 \cup \mathbb{A}2 \cup \mathbb{AU}1 \cup \mathbb{AU}2.$

The state of a user $U_i$ is a pair of a variable state assigning a value (or the undefined value $\perp$) to each variable and a permission state that defines the set of groups of permissions. In the following, we use $\sigma$ to denote the global state (state of all the users $\langle U_1, \ldots, U_m\rangle$) defined on $State_\perp^m$. The initial state for an architecture $\mathcal{PA}$ is denoted by $Init^{\mathcal{PA}} = \langle Init_1^{\mathcal{PA}}, \ldots, Init_m^{\mathcal{PA}}\rangle$ with:

$$\forall i \in [1, m], Init_i^{\mathcal{PA}} = (Empty, \{\emptyset^i\})$$

where $Empty$ denotes the empty variable state ($\forall X \in Var, Empty(X) = \perp$). In addition, each group of permission is empty as well. The semantics function $S_T$ is defined in Table 1, which specifies the impact of a trace on the state of each user $U_i$. It is defined as an iteration through the trace with function $S_E$ defining the impact of each type of event on the states of the users.

The notation $\epsilon.\theta$ is used to denote a trace whose first element is $\epsilon$ and the rest of the trace is $\theta$. Each event modifies only the state of the user $U_i$. This modification is expressed as $\sigma[\sigma_i/(v, p, t)]$ (or $\sigma[\sigma_i/\perp]$ in the case of the undefined state) that replaces the variable and permission parts of the state of $U_i$ by $v$ and $p$ respectively. We assume that no event $\theta_{a'}$ with $a' > a$ involves user $U_i$ if its state $\sigma_i$ is equal to $\perp$ after the occurrence of $\theta_a$ (i.e., any error in the activity trace of a user causes termination of the trace).

As an effect of the event $own_{ow}\left(X_{id}^{ow,ds} : V, t\right)$, the state of $U_i$ is updated by binding value $V$ to $X_{id}^{ow,ds}$, while the permission state is unchanged. Event $possess_{sp}$ has a similar effect as $own_{ow}$, but from the service provider's perspective. Events $groupact_{i,tar}$, $grouphas_{i,tar}$ ($ungroupact_{i,tar}$, $ungrouphas_{i,tar}$) update $\sigma_i^p$ by adding (removing) $tar$ into (from) $\mathcal{G}$, respectively. Event $deletereq_i$ does not affect the current state, while $delete_{sp}$ changes the value of $X_{id}^{ow,ds}$ to $\perp$ in the state of every user. As a result of *act1*, the state of every $U_j$ who is permitted (by $U_i$ and $U_{ow}$) to have $X_{id}^{ow,ds}$ after $U_i$ performs *act1* on it, is updated with $X_{id}^{ow,ds}/V$. Event *act2* also updates the states of $U_j$ with $X_{id}^{ow,ds}/V$, for every $U_j$. In this case, we consider the permission sets allowed by $U_i$, $U_{ow}$ and $U_{tar}$. Finally, the revocation counterparts *unact1* and *unact2* replace the value of $X_{id}^{ow,ds}$ by $\perp$.

$$
\begin{aligned}
S_T :\ Trace \times State^m_\perp &\to State^m_\perp \\
S_E :\ Event \times \times State^m_\perp &\to State^m_\perp \\
S_T(\langle\rangle, \sigma) &= \sigma \\
S_T(\epsilon.\theta, \sigma) &= S_T(\theta, S_E(\epsilon, \sigma)) \\
S_E(own_i\left(X^{ow,ds}_{id} : V, t\right), \sigma) &= \sigma[\sigma_i/(\sigma^v_i[X^{ow,ds}_{id}/V], \sigma^p_i, t)] \\
S_E(possess_{sp}\left(X : V, t\right), \sigma) &= \sigma[\sigma_{sp}/(\sigma^v_{sp}[X/V], \sigma^p_{sp}, t)] \\
S_E(groupact_{i,tar}(\mathcal{G}, t), \sigma) &= \sigma[\sigma_i/\sigma^v_i, \sigma^p_i[\mathcal{G}/(\mathcal{G} \cup \{tar\})], t)],\ \mathcal{G} = \mathcal{G}^{can}_{act}(U_i, X^{ow,ds}_{id}) \\
S_E(ungroupact_{i,tar}(\mathcal{G}, t), \sigma) &= \sigma[\sigma_i/\sigma^v_i, \sigma^p_i[\mathcal{G}/(\mathcal{G} \backslash \{tar\})], t)],\ \mathcal{G} = \mathcal{G}^{can}_{act}(U_i, X^{ow,ds}_{id}) \\
S_E(grouphas_{i,tar}(\mathcal{G}, t), \sigma) &= \sigma[\sigma_i/\sigma^v_i, \sigma^p_i[\mathcal{G}/(\mathcal{G} \cup \{tar\})], t)],\ \mathcal{G} = \mathcal{G}^{group}_{has}(X^{ow,ds}_{id}) \\
S_E(ungrouphas_{i,tar}(\mathcal{G}, t), \sigma) &= \sigma[\sigma_i/\sigma^v_i, \sigma^p_i[\mathcal{G}/(\mathcal{G} \backslash \{tar\})], t)],\ \mathcal{G} = \mathcal{G}^{group}_{has}(X^{ow,ds}_{id}) \\
S_E(deletereq_i(X^{ow,ds}_{id} : V, t), \sigma) &= \sigma \\
S_E(delete_{sp}(X^{ow,ds}_{id} : V, t), \sigma) &= \sigma[\sigma_l/(\sigma^v_l[\{X^{ow,ds}_{id}/\perp\}], \sigma^p_l, t) \mid \forall l \in \mathcal{U}]. \\
S_E(act1_i(X^{ow,ds}_{id} : V, t), \sigma) &= \sigma[\sigma_j/(\sigma^v_j[\{X^{ow,ds}_{id}/V\}], \sigma^p_j, t) \mid \\
&\qquad \forall U_j : U_j \in Have_{Act1_i} \ \wedge\ \mathcal{G}^{can}_{act1}(U_i, X^{ow,ds}_{id})] \\
S_E(unact1_i(X^{ow,ds}_{id} : V, t), \sigma) &= \sigma[\sigma_j/(\sigma^v_j[\{X^{ow,ds}_{id}/\perp\}], \sigma^p_j, t) \mid \\
&\qquad \forall U_j : U_j \in Have_{Act1_i} \ \wedge\ \mathcal{G}^{can}_{act1}(U_i, X^{ow,ds}_{id})] \\
S_E(act2_{i,tar}(X^{ow,ds}_{id} : V, t), \sigma) &= \sigma[\sigma_j/(\sigma^v_j[\{X^{ow,ds}_{id}/V\}], \sigma^p_j, t) \mid \\
&\qquad \forall U_j : U_j \in Have_{Act2_{i,tar}} \ \wedge\ \mathcal{G}^{can}_{act2}(U_i, X^{ow,ds}_{id})] \\
S_E(unact2_{i,tar}(X^{ow,ds}_{id} : V, t), \sigma) &= \sigma[\sigma_j/(\sigma^v_j[\{X^{ow,ds}_{id}/\perp\}], \sigma^p_j, t) \mid \\
&\qquad \forall U_j : U_j \in Have_{Act2_{i,tar}} \ \wedge\ \mathcal{G}^{can}_{act2}(U_i, X^{ow,ds}_{id})]
\end{aligned}
$$

Table 1: Semantics of events traces.

**Definition 5 (Semantics of architectures)** *The semantics of an architecture $\mathcal{PA}$ is defined as: $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{PA}) = \{\sigma \in State^m_\perp \mid \exists \theta \in T(\mathcal{PA}), S_T(\theta, Init^{\mathcal{PA}}) = \sigma\}$.*

**Definition 6 (Compatibility)** *A trace $\theta$ of length $\overline{\theta}$ is compatible with an architecture $\mathcal{PA}$ if and only if:*

$$\forall a \in [1, \overline{\theta}], \exists \alpha \in \mathcal{PA}, \mathcal{C}(\theta_a, \alpha)$$

*where $\mathcal{C}(\epsilon, \alpha)$ holds if and only if $\epsilon$ can be obtained from $\alpha$ by adding specific values $V$ for variables and instantiating index variables to constant index values.*

We can now define the semantics of an architecture $\mathcal{PA}$ as the set of the possible states produced by consistent traces.

## 5.3 Privacy Logic

In this section, we propose a logic to reason about the privacy and data control requirements of architectures. The logic is based on the architecture language $\mathcal{A}_{DC}$ defined above.

$$
\begin{aligned}
\phi ::= &\ HAS_{sp}(X^{ow,ds}_{id}) \mid HAS_i(X^{ow,ds}_{id}, t) \mid HAS^{not}_i(X^{ow,ds}_{id}, t) \mid HAS^{never}_i(X^{ow,ds}_{id}) \\
&\mid \phi_1 \wedge \phi_2
\end{aligned}
$$

Definition 7 provides the semantics of a property $\phi$.

**Definition 7** *The semantics $S(\phi)$ of a property $\phi$ is defined in Table 2 as the set of architectures satisfying $\phi$.*

$\mathcal{PA} \in S(HAS_i\left(X_{id}^{ow,ds},t\right)) \Leftrightarrow \exists\ \sigma \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{PA})\text{:}\quad \sigma_i = (\sigma_i^v,\ \sigma_i^p,\ t) \wedge \sigma_i^v(X_{id}^{ow,ds}) \neq \perp$ and if completely defined ( $X_{id}^{ow,ds}$ does not contain any $\perp$ )

$\mathcal{PA} \in S(HAS_i^{not}\left(X_{id}^{ow,ds},t\right)) \Leftrightarrow \exists\ \sigma \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{PA})\text{: } \sigma_i = (\sigma_i^v,\ \sigma_i^p,\ t) \wedge \sigma_i^v(X_{id}^{ow,ds}) = \perp$

$\mathcal{PA} \in S(HAS_i^{never}\left(X_{id}^{ow,ds}\right)) \Leftrightarrow \forall\ \sigma \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{PA}) : \sigma_i^v(X_{id}^{ow,ds}) = \perp$

$\mathcal{PA} \in S(\phi_1 \wedge \phi_2) \Leftrightarrow \mathcal{PA} \in S(\phi_1) \wedge \mathcal{PA} \in S(\phi_2)$

Table 2: Semantics of the HAS properties.

An architecture satisfies the $HAS_i(X_{id}^{ow,ds},t)$ property if and only if $U_i$ may obtain the value of $X_{id}^{ow,ds}$ in at least one compatible execution trace whereas $HAS_i^{never}(X_{id}^{ow,ds})$ holds if and only if no execution trace can lead to a state in which $U_i$ gets a value of $X_{id}^{ow,ds}$. Finally, $HAS_i^{not}(X_{id}^{ow,ds}$, $t)$ holds from at the time $t$, after which $U_i$ does not get a value of $X_{id}^{ow,ds}$.

In order to reason about the privacy property of architectures, a set of deduction rules (axioms) of the data control logic is provided. The fact that an architecture $\mathcal{PA}$ satisfies a property $\phi$ is denoted by $\mathcal{PA} \vdash \phi$. Ten deduction rules ($H1$-$H10$) are defined in the Table 4 to capture privacy related requirements.

Let us consider the abbreviations in Table 3.

$$Have_{Act1_i} = \mathcal{G}_{has}^{by}(U_i,\{U_i\},X_{id}^{ow,ds})\ \cap\ \mathcal{G}_{has}^{by}(U_{ow},\{U_i\},X_{id}^{ow,ds}).$$

$$\begin{aligned} Have_{Act2_{i,tar}} = {} & \mathcal{G}_{has}^{by}(U_i,\{U_i\},X_{id}^{ow,ds})\ \cap\ \mathcal{G}_{has}^{been}(U_i,\{U_{tar}\},X_{id}^{ow,ds}) \cap \\ & \mathcal{G}_{has}^{by}(U_{ow},\{U_i\},X_{id}^{ow,ds})\ \cap\ \mathcal{G}_{has}^{been}(U_{ow},\{U_{tar}\},X_{id}^{ow,ds})) \cap \\ & \mathcal{G}_{has}^{by}(U_{tar},\{U_i\},X_{id}^{ow,ds})\ \cap\ \mathcal{G}_{has}^{been}(U_{tar},\{U_{tar}\},X_{id}^{ow,ds}). \end{aligned}$$

Table 3: Abbreviations of the has policy.

In Table 4, rule $H1$ says that if the architecture contains $Own_{ow}\left(X_{id}^{ow,ds}\right)$ and there is an event $own_{ow}(X_{id}^{ow,ds} : V,\ t)$, then $U_{ow}$ has $X_{id}^{ow,ds}$ at time $t$. $H2$ says that if $Act1_i\left(X_{id}^{ow,ds}\right)$ is part of the architecture and there is an event $act1_i\left(X_{id}^{ow,ds} : V,t\right)$ occured during the system run, and if user $U_i$ can (is allowed to) perform *act1* on data $X_{id}^{ow,ds}$ then every $U_j$ (who is allowed by the data policy to have this data after *act1* has been performed) will have $X_{id}^{ow,ds}$ at time $t$. $H3$ is interpreted similarly to $H2$ but with activity $Act2_{i,tar}$ and event *act2*, and $H4$ is concerned with the activity $Group_{i,tar}$ and event $group_{i,tar}$. $H5$ capturing that if $UnAct1_i\left(X_{id}^{ow,ds}\right)$ is part of the architecture and there is an event $unact1_i\left(X_{id}^{ow,ds} : V,t\right)$ occured, as well as $U_i$ can perform *unact1* on $X_{id}^{ow,ds}$, then the corresponding $U_j$ will not have $X_{id}^{ow,ds}$ from time $t$. $H6$ and $H7$ are similar to $H5$ but are defined on *UnAct2* and *UnGroup* activities and corresponding events. Points $H8/(a)$-$H8/(b)$ say that if the service provider possesses the encryption of $X_{id}^{ow,ds}$ with its own key

$X^{sp}_{key}$, then it has the data $X^{ow,ds}_{id}$. $H9$ captures that in case none of the $H1$-$H4$ takes place from $U_j$'s perspevtive during the system run, then $U_j$ never have $X^{ow,ds}_{id}$. Finally, $H10$ addresses the case when the architecture contains $Delete_{sp}\left(X^{ow,ds}_{id}, dd\right)$ and the events $deletereq_i\left(X^{ow,ds}_{id} : V, t\right)$ and $delete_{sp}\left(X^{ow,ds}_{id} : V, t'\right)$ take place (i.e., a deletion request has been sent by user $U_i$ at $t$ and the deletion took effect at $t'$), then $t'$ should be within $dd$ delay since $t$, and no user has the deleted data $X^{ow,ds}_{id}$ from time $t'$.

# 6 From Policy to Architecture

In this section, we provide a systematic mapping procedure from the policy level to the architecture level, and provide some formal properties of the mapping.

First of all, the mapping between the privacy policy syntax and the architecture syntax is discussed, and then the correspondence between their semantics is provided.

Each action $act1 \in \mathbb{A}1$, $act2 \in \mathbb{A}1$, $unact1 \in \mathbb{UA}1$, and $unact2 \in \mathbb{UA}2$ is mapped to a corresponding activity in the architecture level, respectively. The predefined activities *deletereq*, *delete*, *group*, *ungroup* are mapped to the corresponding architecture activities *Deletereq*, *Delete*, *Group*, *UnGroup*, respectively.

In addition, each data $dt = (ow, ds, \theta, id, \dots)$ in the policy is corresponding to each variable $X^{ow,ds}_{id}$ in the architecture, where $\mathrm{TYPE}(X^{ow,ds}_{id}) = \theta$.

$$\mathbb{D}(ow, ds, \theta, id) = \{X^{ow,ds}_{id} \mid \mathrm{TYPE}(X^{ow,ds}_{id}) = \theta\}$$

Each deletion delay $dd$ in the policy corresponds to a deletion delay $dd$ in the architecture (namely, in $Delete_i(X^{ow,ds}_{id}, dd)$). The pair of storage place $\mathrm{W}_{st}$ ($wh = \{clientloc, sploc\}$), and strorage form $\mathrm{H}_{st}$ ($ho = \{enc, plain\}$) are mapped into the architecture level by the mapping function $\mathbb{W}$ as follows: when $wh = clientloc$ the corresponding architecture includes only $Own_i(X^{ow,ds}_{id})$, regardless of the value of $ho$. This is because when the user data is stored in the user's computer (client side), then only this user owns and possesses initially the data. In case of server side storage, for the pair ($\{sploc\}$, $\{plain\}$) $\mathbb{W}$ returns both $Own_{ow}(X^{ow,ds}_{id})$ and $Possess_{sp}(X^{ow,ds}_{id})$ architectural elements. In case of storing in an encryted form but with the service provider's key, ($enc$, $spkey$), the service provider possesses the ciphertext and its key. Finally, if the data is encrypted with the client key (not known by the service provider), then the service provider only possesses the ciphertext.

---

$\mathbb{W}(clientloc, (plain,\text{-})/(enc,spkey)/(enc,clkey)) = \{Own_{ow}(X^{ow,ds}_{id}) \mid \forall\, U_{ow} \in \mathcal{U}\}$
$\mathbb{W}(sploc, (plain, \text{-})) = \{Own_{ow}(X^{ow,ds}_{id}), Possess_{sp}(X^{ow,ds}_{id}) \mid \forall\, U_{ow} \in \mathcal{U}\}$
$\mathbb{W}(sploc, (enc, spkey)) = \{Own_{ow}(X^{ow,ds}_{id}), Possess_{sp}(enc(X^{ow,ds}_{id}, X^{sp}_{key})),$
$\qquad Possess_{sp}(X^{sp}_{key}) \mid \forall\, U_{ow} \in \mathcal{U}\}$
$\mathbb{W}(sploc, (enc, clkey)) = \{Own_{ow}(X^{ow,ds}_{id}), Own_{ow}(X^{ow}_{key})$
$\qquad Possess_{sp}(enc(X^{ow,ds}_{id}, X^{ow}_{key})) \mid \forall\, U_{ow} \in \mathcal{U}\}.$

---

The action policy $act$ for a given data $dt = (ow, ds, \theta, id, \dots)$ corresponds to the permission sets in the architecture level as follows:

---

$\mathbb{P}_A(ow, ds, \theta, id, \pi_{dt}.acp.\mathcal{G}^{can}_{act1}) = \{\mathcal{G}^{can}_{act1}(U_i, X^{ow,ds}_{id}) \mid$
$\qquad \mathrm{TYPE}(X^{ow,ds}_{id}) = \theta, \forall\, U_i \in \mathcal{U}\}$
$\mathbb{P}_A(ow, ds, \theta, id, \pi_{dt}.acp.\mathcal{G}^{can}_{act2}) = \{\mathcal{G}^{can}_{act2}(U_i, X^{ow,ds}_{id}) \mid$
$\qquad \mathrm{TYPE}(X^{ow,ds}_{id}) = \theta, \forall\, U_i \in \mathcal{U}\}$

$$\mathbb{P}_A(ow,\, ds,\, \theta,\, id,\, \pi_{dt}.acp.\mathcal{G}^{can}_{unact1}) = \{\mathcal{G}^{can}_{unact1}(U_i,\, X^{ow,ds}_{id}) \mid \mathrm{TYPE}(X^{ow,ds}_{id}) = \theta,\, \forall\, U_i \in \mathcal{U}\}$$
$$\mathbb{P}_A(ow,\, ds,\, \theta,\, id,\, \pi_{dt}.acp.\mathcal{G}^{can}_{unact2}) = \{\mathcal{G}^{can}_{unact2}(U_i,\, X^{ow,ds}_{id}) \mid \mathrm{TYPE}(X^{ow,ds}_{id}) = \theta,\, \forall\, U_i \in \mathcal{U}\}$$

---

Similarly, the has policy *has* for a given data $dt = (ow,\, ds,\, \theta,\, id,\, \ldots)$ corresponds to the permission sets in the architecture level as follows:

---

$$\mathbb{P}_H(ow,\, ds,\, \theta,\, id,\, \pi_{dt}.has.\mathcal{G}^{by}_{has}(\mathcal{S}^{by}_{act1})) = \{\mathcal{G}^{by}_{has}(U_i,\, \mathcal{Z}^{by}_{act1}(X^{ow,ds}_{id}),\, X^{ow,ds}_{id}) \mid \mathrm{TYPE}(X^{ow,ds}_{id}) = \theta,\, \forall\, U_i \in \mathcal{U}\}$$
$$\mathbb{P}_H(ow,\, ds,\, \theta,\, id,\, \pi_{dt}.has.\mathcal{G}^{by}_{has}(\mathcal{S}^{by}_{act2})) = \{\mathcal{G}^{by}_{has}(U_i,\, \mathcal{Z}^{by}_{act2}(X^{ow,ds}_{id}),\, X^{ow,ds}_{id}) \mid \mathrm{TYPE}(X^{ow,ds}_{id}) = \theta,\, \forall\, U_i \in \mathcal{U}\}$$
$$\mathbb{P}_H(ow,\, ds,\, \theta,\, id,\, \pi_{dt}.has.\mathcal{G}^{been}_{has}(\mathcal{S}^{been}_{act1})) = \{\mathcal{G}^{been}_{has}(U_i,\, \mathcal{Z}^{been}_{act1}(X^{ow,ds}_{id}) \mid X^{ow,ds}_{id}) \mid \mathrm{TYPE}(X^{ow,ds}_{id}) = \theta,\, \forall\, U_i \in \mathcal{U}\}$$
$$\mathbb{P}_H(ow,\, ds,\, \theta,\, id,\, \pi_{dt}.has.\mathcal{G}^{been}_{has}(\mathcal{S}^{been}_{act2})) = \{\mathcal{G}^{been}_{has}(U_i,\, \mathcal{Z}^{been}_{act2}(X^{ow,ds}_{id}),\, X^{ow,ds}_{id}) \mid \mathrm{TYPE}(X^{ow,ds}_{id}) = \theta,\, \forall\, U_i \in \mathcal{U}\}$$

---

In the sequel, for the sake of brevity we let $tup = (ow,\, ds,\, \theta,\, id)$. The activities in the architecture are extracted from the policy events based on the function *Arch* as follows:

---

$$Arch(own,\, t,\, ow,\, dt,\, \pi_{dt}) = \{Own_{ow}(X^{ow,ds}_{id})\}$$

$$Arch(store,\, t,\, dt,\, \pi_{dt}) = \mathbb{W}(\pi_{dt}.wh,\, \pi_{dt}.ho)$$

$$Arch(deletereq,\, t,\, or,\, dt,\, \pi_{dt}) = Deletereq_{or}(X^{ow,ds}_{id})$$

$$Arch(delete,\, t,\, dt) = \{Delete_{or}(X^{ow,ds}_{id})\}$$

$$Arch(groupact,\, t,\, or,\, tar,\, dt,\, \pi_{dt}.acp.\mathcal{G}^{can}_{act}) = \{Group_{or,tar}(\mathcal{G}^{can}_{act})\} \cup \mathbb{P}_A(tup,\, \pi_{dt}.acp.\mathcal{G}^{can}_{act})$$

$$Arch(ungroupact,\, t,\, or,\, tar,\, dt,\, \pi_{dt}.acp.\mathcal{G}^{can}_{act}) = \{Ungroup_{or,tar}(\mathcal{G}^{can}_{act})\}$$

$$Arch(grouphas,\, t,\, or,\, tar,\, dt,\, \pi_{dt}.has.\mathcal{G}^{group}_{has}) = \{Group_{or,tar}(\mathcal{G}^{group}_{has})\}$$

$$Arch(ungrouphas,\, t,\, or,\, tar,\, dt,\, \pi_{dt}.acp.\mathcal{G}^{can}_{act}) = \{Ungroup_{or,tar}(\mathcal{G}^{group}_{has})\}$$

$$Arch(act1,\, t,\, or,\, dt,\, \pi_{dt}) = \{Act1_{or}(X^{ow,ds}_{id})\} \cup \mathbb{P}_A(tup,\, \pi_{dt}.acp.\mathcal{G}^{can}_{act1}) \cup \mathbb{P}_H(tup,\, \pi_{dt}.has.\mathcal{G}^{by}_{has}(\mathcal{S}^{by}_{act1})) \cup \mathbb{P}_H(tup,\, \pi_{dt}.has.\mathcal{G}^{been}_{has}(\mathcal{S}^{been}_{act1}))$$

$$Arch(act2,\, t,\, or,\, tar,\, dt,\, \pi_{dt}) = \{Act2_{or,tar}(X^{ow,ds}_{id})\} \cup \mathbb{P}_A(tup,\, \pi_{dt}.acp.\mathcal{G}^{can}_{act2}) \cup \mathbb{P}_H(tup,\, \pi_{dt}.has.\mathcal{G}^{by}_{has}(\mathcal{S}^{by}_{act2})) \cup \mathbb{P}_H(tup,\, \pi_{dt}.has.\mathcal{G}^{been}_{has}(\mathcal{S}^{been}_{act2}))$$

$$Arch(unact1,\, t,\, or,\, dt,\, \pi_{dt}) = \{Unact1_{or}(X^{ow,ds}_{id})\} \cup \mathbb{P}_A(tup,\, \pi_{dt}.acp.\mathcal{G}^{can}_{unact1})$$

$$Arch(unact2,\, t,\, or,\, tar,\, dt,\, \pi_{dt}) =$$

$\{Unact2_{or,tar}(X_{id}^{ow,ds})\} \cup \mathbb{P}_A(tup, \pi_{dt}.acp.\mathcal{G}_{unact2}^{can})$

In the following, we provide the properties that capture the correspondence between the trace compliance rules (in the policy level) and the deduction rules (in the architecture level).

**Property 1** *The connection between the compliance rules in the policy level and architecture level is summarized in points* $P1$-$P6$*:*

***P1:*** *If* $C3$ *does not applicable for any possible traces in the policy level, then* $H9$ *is applicable in the architecture level, and vice versa.*

***P2:*** *If* $C3/(i)$ *is applicable in at least one possible trace in the policy level, then* $H1$ *is applicable in the architecture level, and vice versa.*

***P3:*** *If* $C3/(ii)$ *is applicable in at least one possible trace in the policy level, then* $H2$ *is applicable in the architecture level, and vice versa.*

***P4:*** *If* $C3/(iii)$ *is applicable in at least one possible trace in the policy level, then* $H3$ *is applicable in the architecture level, and vice versa.*

***P5:*** *If* $C4$ *is applicable in at least one possible trace in the policy level, then* $H8/(a)$-$(b)$ *is applicable in the architecture level, and vice versa.*

***P6:*** *If* $C5$ *is applicable in a possible trace in the policy level, then* $H10$ *is applicable in the architecture level, and vice versa.*

Note that in Property 1 we only consider compliance rules that affect the HAS properties. Intuitively, $P1$ says that if user $U_j$ has not been granted any right to have the data $dt = (ow, ds, \theta, id, \dots)$ in any possible traces, then none of the pre-conditions of $H1$-$H4$ holds, which results in $HAS_j^{never}(X_{id}^{ow,ds})$. The situation is similar in the reverse direction. $P2$ captures the case when $U_{ow}$ has a data because it is an owner of that data. $P3$ and $P4$ capture the case when $U_{ow}$ has a data as a consequence of an action from $\mathbb{A}1$ and $\mathbb{A}2$, respectively. $P5$ considers the case when the service provider initially has a data. Finally, $P6$ captures the correspondence between the rules on deletion delays.

# 7 Case Studies

In this section, we provide some illustrative examples to demonstrate the usage of our languages on real-world online services. Our first case study is on Facebook.

## 7.1 Facebook Policy and Architecture

In case of Facebook, we have the following activity sets[3].

$\mathbb{A}1 = \{like, comment\}$, and $\mathbb{UA}1 = \{unlike, uncomment\}$, $\mathbb{A}2 = \{post, tag, mention, share\}$, and $\mathbb{UA}2 = \{unpost, untag, unmention, unshare\}$.

The data control policy of Facebook can be given as follows:

$$\pi_{dt} = (ap, dm, wh, ho, acp, has), \text{ where}$$

[3]Note that we do not address completeness, but only focus on the most important and well-known activities of Facebook for demonstrating purpose.

in case of TYPE($dt$) $\in$ {Email, Username, Birthday, Hobbies, Favourite-Music, Favourite-Movies}, $\pi_{dt}.ap$ = {register, enrolment}, $\pi_{dt}.wh$ = {sploc}, $\pi_{dt}.ho$ = {(enc, spkey)}, while for TYPE($dt$) $\in$ {UpPhotos, UpVideos, LinkPost}, $\pi_{dt}.ap$ = {social-networking}, $\pi_{dt}.wh$ = {sploc}, $\pi_{dt}.ho$ = {(enc, spkey)}. Here UpPhotos and UpVideos denote the photos and videos uploaded by the users and not the embedded links, while LinkPost representing the posts with (embedded) links. The values of $\pi_{dt}.wh$ and $\pi_{dt}.ho$ say that the uploaded videos and photos as well as the posts with links are stored at the service provider's site and in encrypted with the service provider's key. Besides the defined $\mathbb{A}1$, $\mathbb{A}2$, $\mathbb{AU}1$, $\mathbb{AU}2$, for each data $dt = (ow, ds, \theta, id, \dots)$ the function $\mathbb{EV}(\mathbb{A}1, \mathbb{A}2, \mathbb{AU}1, \mathbb{AU}2, ow, ds, \theta, id)$ returns the following set of possible events:

***Ev1*:** $(own, t, or, dt, \pi_{dt})$

***Ev2*:** $(store, t, dt, \pi_{dt})$

***Ev3*:** $(use, t, dt, purposes)$

***Ev4*:** $(deletereq, t, or, dt, \pi_{dt})$

***Ev5*:** $(delete, t, dt)$

***Ev6*:** $(grouplike, t, or, tar, dt, \pi_{dt}.acp.\mathcal{G}^{can}_{like})$

***Ev7*:** $(ungrouplike, t, or, tar, dt, \pi_{dt}.acp.\mathcal{G}^{can}_{like})$

***Ev8*:** $(groupcomment, t, or, tar, dt, \pi_{dt}.acp.\mathcal{G}^{can}_{comment})$

***Ev9*:** $(ungroupcomment, t, or, tar, dt, \pi_{dt}.acp.\mathcal{G}^{can}_{comment})$

***Ev10*:** $(grouppost, t, or, tar, dt, \pi_{dt}.acp.\mathcal{G}^{can}_{post})$

***Ev11*:** $(ungrouppost, t, or, tar, dt, \pi_{dt}.acp.\mathcal{G}^{can}_{post})$

***Ev12*:** $(grouptag, t, or, tar, dt, \pi_{dt}.acp.\mathcal{G}^{can}_{tag})$

***Ev13*:** $(ungrouptag, t, or, tar, dt, \pi_{dt}.acp.\mathcal{G}^{can}_{tag})$

***Ev14*:** $(groupmention, t, or, tar, dt, \pi_{dt}.acp.\mathcal{G}^{can}_{mention})$

***Ev15*:** $(ungroupmention, t, or, tar, dt, \pi_{dt}.acp.\mathcal{G}^{can}_{mention})$

***Ev16*:** $(groupshare, t, or, tar, dt, \pi_{dt}.acp.\mathcal{G}^{can}_{share})$

***Ev17*:** $(ungroupshare, t, or, tar, dt, \pi_{dt}.acp.\mathcal{G}^{can}_{share})$

***Ev18*:** $(grouphas, t, or, tar, dt, \pi_{dt}.has.\mathcal{G}^{group}_{has})$

***Ev19*:** $(ungrouphas, t, or, tar, dt, \pi_{dt}.has.\mathcal{G}^{group}_{has})$

***Ev20*:** $(like, t, or, dt, \pi_{dt})$

***Ev21*:** $(comment, t, or, dt, \pi_{dt})$

***Ev22*:** $(unlike, t, or, dt, \pi_{dt})$

***Ev23*:** $(uncomment, t, or, dt, \pi_{dt})$

***Ev24*:** $(post, t, or, tar, dt, \pi_{dt})$

***Ev25*:** $(tag, t, or, tar, dt, \pi_{dt})$

***Ev26*:** $(mention, t, or, tar, dt, \pi_{dt})$

***Ev27*:** $(share, t, or, tar, dt, \pi_{dt})$

***Ev28*:** $(unpost,\ t,\ or,\ tar,\ dt,\ \pi_{dt})$

***Ev29*:** $(untag,\ t,\ or,\ tar,\ dt,\ \pi_{dt})$

***Ev30*:** $(unmention,\ t,\ or,\ tar,\ dt,\ \pi_{dt})$

***Ev31*:** $(unshare,\ t,\ or,\ tar,\ dt,\ \pi_{dt})$

Note that our model is designed to be fine-grained to fit generic systems and enable systematic design, however, in case of Facebook some simplification can be made in terms of events *groupact*, *ungroupact*, *grouphas*, *ungrouphas*. Namely, in Facebook we have specific (default) groups such as *friends* , *friends of friends*. Hence, in this specific case *groupact*, *ungroupact*, *grouphas*, *ungrouphas* is equivalent to (can be simplified with) *addfriends* and *unfriends*. Therefore the events *Ev6-Ev19* can be simplified with the events

***Ev1*:** $(addfriends,\ t,\ or,\ tar,\ dt,\ \{\pi_{dt}.acp.\mathcal{G}^{can}_{like},\ \pi_{dt}.acp.\mathcal{G}^{can}_{comment},\ \pi_{dt}.acp.\mathcal{G}^{can}_{post},\ \pi_{dt}.acp.\mathcal{G}^{can}_{tag},\ \pi_{dt}.acp.\mathcal{G}^{can}_{mention},\ \pi_{dt}.has.\mathcal{G}^{group}_{has}\})$

***Ev2*:** $(unfriends, t, or, tar, dt, \{\pi_{dt}.acp.\mathcal{G}^{can}_{like}, \pi_{dt}.acp.\mathcal{G}^{can}_{comment}, \pi_{dt}.acp.\mathcal{G}^{can}_{post}, \pi_{dt}.acp.\mathcal{G}^{can}_{tag}, \pi_{dt}.acp.\mathcal{G}^{can}_{mention},\ \pi_{dt}.has.\mathcal{G}^{group}_{has}\})$.

## 7.2 From Facebook Policy to Architecture

Applying the function *Arch* to the policy level elements, the following (simplified) architecture for Facebook is derived:

---

$\mathcal{PA} ::= \{\mathcal{F}\}$

$\mathcal{F} ::=$
$Own_i(X^{ow,ds}_{id}) \mid Posses_{sp}(X^{ow,ds}_{id}) \mid Posses_{sp}(F(X^{ow_1,ds_1}_{id_1}, \ldots, X^{ow_r,ds_r}_{id_r}))$
$\mid Posses_{sp}(X),\ X \in \{X^{ow_1,ds_1}_{id_1}, \ldots, X^{ow_r,ds_r}_{id_r}\}$
$\mid GroupLike_{i,tar}(\mathcal{G}') \mid UnGroupLike_{i,tar}(\mathcal{G}') \mid GroupPost_{i,tar}(\mathcal{G}')$
$\mid UnGroupPost_{i,tar}(\mathcal{G}') \mid GroupTag_{i,tar}(\mathcal{G}') \mid UnGroupTag_{i,tar}(\mathcal{G}')$
$\mid GroupComment_{i,tar}(\mathcal{G}') \mid UnGroupComment_{i,tar}(\mathcal{G}') \mid GroupShare_{i,tar}(\mathcal{G}')$
$\mid UnGroupShare_{i,tar}(\mathcal{G}') \mid GroupMention_{i,tar}(\mathcal{G}') \mid UnGroupMention_{i,tar}(\mathcal{G}')$
$\mid GroupHas_{i,tar}(\mathcal{G}') \mid UnGroupHas_{i,tar}(\mathcal{G}') \mid DeleteReq_i(X^{ow,ds}_{id}) \mid Delete_{sp}(X^{ow,ds}_{id}, dd)$
$\mid Like_i(X^{ow,ds}_{id}) \mid UnLike_i(X^{ow,ds}_{id}) \mid Comment_i(X^{ow,ds}_{id}) \mid UnComment_i(X^{ow,ds}_{id})$
$\mid Post_{i,tar}(X^{ow,ds}_{id}) \mid UnPost_{i,tar}(X^{ow,ds}_{id}) \mid Tag_{i,tar}(X^{ow,ds}_{id}) \mid UnTag_{i,tar}(X^{ow,ds}_{id})$
$\mid Mention_{i,tar}(X^{ow,ds}_{id}) \mid UnMention_{i,tar}(X^{ow,ds}_{id}) \mid Share_{i,tar}(X^{ow,ds}_{id})$
$\mid UnShare_{i,tar}(X^{ow,ds}_{id})$

---

Taking into account the specific *addfriends* and *unfriends* features of Facebook, we have the following simplified architecture:

---

$\mathcal{PA} ::= \{\mathcal{F}\}$

$\mathcal{F} ::=$
$Own_i(X^{ow,ds}_{id}) \mid Posses_{sp}(X^{ow,ds}_{id}) \mid Posses_{sp}(F(X^{ow_1,ds_1}_{id_1}, \ldots, X^{ow_r,ds_r}_{id_r}))$
$\mid Posses_{sp}(X),\ X \in \{X^{ow_1,ds_1}_{id_1}, \ldots, X^{ow_r,ds_r}_{id_r}\}$
$\mid AddFriends_{i,tar}(\mathcal{G}') \mid UnFriends_{i,tar}(\mathcal{G}') \mid DeleteReq_i(X^{ow,ds}_{id}) \mid Delete_{sp}(X^{ow,ds}_{id}, dd)$
$\mid Like_i(X^{ow,ds}_{id}) \mid UnLike_i(X^{ow,ds}_{id}) \mid Comment_i(X^{ow,ds}_{id}) \mid UnComment_i(X^{ow,ds}_{id})$
$\mid Post_{i,tar}(X^{ow,ds}_{id}) \mid UnPost_{i,tar}(X^{ow,ds}_{id}) \mid Tag_{i,tar}(X^{ow,ds}_{id}) \mid UnTag_{i,tar}(X^{ow,ds}_{id})$

$| \ Mention_{i,tar}(X_{id}^{ow,ds}) \ | \ UnMention_{i,tar}(X_{id}^{ow,ds}) \ | \ Share_{i,tar}(X_{id}^{ow,ds})$
$| \ UnShare_{i,tar}(X_{id}^{ow,ds})$

---

# 8 Conclusion and Future Works

In this paper, we investigated the problem of automated system design focusing on the accountability and personal data control aspects. We proposed a systematic design approach based on semi-formal method. In particular, we proposed a high-level policy language and an architeture language, as well as a systematic generation of the corresponding architectures from the specified policies. The policy language enables us to encode the current international (EU, UK, US, Japan, etc.) regulations written in natural language in a more precise way. Further, based on the defined semantics and compliant properties we can also reason about the data control requirements fulfilled by the system. Finally, this policy language enables us to compare policies with each other (e.g., comparing a current policy defined by company with updated international regulation).

The proposed architecture language can be used to define high-level architectures (functionality) of systems. The semantics and deduction rules of the language enables us to reason about the data control properties of systems. Eventually, the defined mapping procedures facilitate a systematic generation of system architectures from the defined corresponding policies. It is important to emphasize that both the proposed policy and architecture languages are easily expandable with further syntax and semantics elements.

Also note that our proposed languages are designed to be "fine-grained" making it suitable for defining generic systems, however, in some specific systems (e.g., Facebook), simplification can be made with specific features (e.g., *addfriends*, *unfriends*) as we can see in the case study section.

One of our future plan is to develop a sofware tool based on the theoretical foundations presented in this paper. We vision a tool that allows users (e.g., policy designers) to define data control policies in the proposed syntax, and featuring automated policy comparison and architecture generation.

# References


[1] The diaspora* Project. `https://diasporafoundation.org/`.

[2] Tresorit: End-to-End Encrypted Cloud Storage for Businesses. `https://www.tresorit.com/`.

[3] Wuala - Secure Cloud Storage. `https://www.wuala.com/`.

[4] The Proposed General Data Protection Regulation: The Consistency Mechanism Explained . European Commission, 6 February 2013. `http://ec.europa.eu/justice/newsroom/data-protection/news/130206_en.htm`.

[5] EU calls for much bigger fines for data breaches. BBC UK, 21 January 2014. `http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/technology-25825690`.

[6] T. Antignac and D. L. Métayer. Privacy architectures: Reasoning about data minimisation and integrity. *CoRR*, abs/1408.1854, 2014.

[7] Article 29 Data Protection Working Party. Opinion 3/2010 on the principle of accountability, 2010. `http://ec.europa.eu/justice/policies/privacy/docs/wpdocs/2010/wp173_en.pdf`.

[8] K. R. Bass L., Clements P. *Software Architecture in Practice*. SEI series in Software Engineering, Addison-Wesley 3rd edn., 2012.

[9] Brendan Van Alsenoy, Valerie Verdoodt, Rob Heyman, Jef Ausloos, Ellen Wauters, Gunes Acar. From social media service to advertising network - A critical analysis of Facebook's Revised Policies and Terms. DRAFT v1.2. The Guardian, 31 March 2015. http://www.theguardian.com/technology/2015/jun/15/belgium-facebook-court-privacy-breaches-ads.

[10] D. Butin and D. Le Métayer. Log Analysis for Data Protection Accountability. In *19th International Symposium on Formal Methods (FM 2014)*, volume 8442 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 163–178. Springer, 2014.

[11] D. Butin and D. Le Métayer. A Guide to End-to-End Privacy Accountability. In *Proceedings of the 1st International Workshop on TEchnical and LEgal aspects of data pRIvacy and SEcurity (TELERISE 2015)*, 2015.

[12] Chris Johnston. Google faces 15 million Euro fines over privacy breaches in Netherlands. The Guardian, 16 December 2015. http://www.theguardian.com/technology/2014/dec/16/google-15m-fines-privacy-breaches-netherlands.

[13] David A. Arnott. Google faces 15 million Euro fines over privacy breaches in Netherlands. Nashville Business Journal, 10 July 2015. http://www.bizjournals.com/nashville/blog/2015/07/google-photos-uploads-images-without-app.html.

[14] Erika McCallister, Tim Grance, Karen Scarfone. Guide to Protecting the Confidentiality of Personally Identifiable Information (PII). NIST Natinonal Institute of Standards and Technology. US Department of Commerce, SP 800-122, 1995.

[15] European Commission. Proposal for a Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council on the Protection of Individuals with Regard to the Processing of Personal Data and on the Free Movement of such Data, 2012.

[16] European Parliament and the Council of the European Union. Directive 95/46/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 24 October 1995 on the Protection of Individuals with Regard to the Processing of Personal Data and on the Free Movement of such Data. 1995.

[17] Glenn Greenwald, Ewen MacAskill. NSA Prism program taps in to user data of Apple, Google and others. The Guardian, 7 June 2013. http://www.theguardian.com/world/2013/jun/06/us-tech-giants-nsa-data.

[18] H. Jaakkola and B. Thalheim. Architecture-driven modelling methodologies. In *Proceedings of the 2011 conference on Information Modelling and Knowledge Bases, XXII. Anneli Heimburger et al. (eds)*. IOS Press, 2011.

[19] Jennifer Van Grove. Facebook sued for allegedly intercepting private messages. CNET, 2 January 2014. http://www.cnet.com/news/facebook-sued-for-allegedly-intercepting-private-messages/.

[20] Karen Kullo. Facebook sued over alleged scanning of private messages. Bloomberg, 2 January 2014. http://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2014-01-02/facebook-sued-over-alleged-scanning-of-private-messages.

[21] Office of Public Sector Information. Data Protection Act 1998, Basic interpretative provisions, 1998. http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1998/29/section/1.

[22] Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. OECD Guidelines on the Protection of Privacy and Transborder Flows of Personal Data, 1980.

[23] Samual Gibbs. Facebook 'tracks all visitors, breaching EU law'. The Guardian, 2 January 2014. http://www.theguardian.com/technology/2015/mar/31/facebook-tracks-all-visitors-breaching-eu-law-report.

[24] Samual Gibbs. Belgium takes Facebook to court over privacy breaches and user tracking. The Guardian, 15 June 2015. http://www.theguardian.com/technology/2015/jun/15/belgium-facebook-court-privacy-breaches-ads.

[25] F. B. Schneider. Accountability for Perfection. *IEEE Security & Privacy*, 7(2):3–4, 2009.

[26] Sean Buckley. Deleting Google Photos won't stop your phone from uploading pictures. Engaget.com, 13 July 2015. http://www.engadget.com/2015/07/13/deleting-google-photos-wont-stop-your-phone-from-uploading-pict/.

$$\textbf{H1}: \frac{Own_{ow}\left(X_{id}^{ow,ds}\right) \in \mathcal{PA} \quad \wedge \quad own_{ow}(X_{id}^{ow,ds}:V,t)}{\mathcal{PA} \vdash HAS_{ow}\left(X_{id}^{ow,ds},t\right)}$$

$$\textbf{H2}: \frac{Act1_i\left(X_{id}^{ow,ds}\right) \in \mathcal{PA} \quad \wedge \quad act1_i\left(X_{id}^{ow,ds}:V,t\right) \quad \wedge \ \forall U_j : U_j \in Have_{Act1_i} \ \wedge \ \mathcal{G}_{act1}^{can}(U_i, X_{id}^{ow,ds})}{\mathcal{PA} \vdash HAS_j\left(X_{id}^{ow,ds},t\right)}$$

$$\textbf{H3}: \frac{Act2_{i,tar}\left(X_{id}^{ow,ds}\right) \in \mathcal{PA} \quad \wedge \quad act2_{i,tar}\left(X_{id}^{ow,ds}:V,t\right) \ \wedge \forall U_j : U_j \in Have_{Act2_{i,tar}} \ \wedge \ \mathcal{G}_{act2}^{can}(U_i, X_{id}^{ow,ds})}{\mathcal{PA} \vdash HAS_j\left(X_{id}^{ow,ds},t\right)}$$

$$\textbf{H4}: \frac{Group_{i,tar}\left(X_{id}^{ow,ds}\right) \in \mathcal{PA} \ \wedge group_{i,tar}\left(X_{id}^{ow,ds}:V,t\right) \ \wedge \ \forall U_j : U_j \in Have_{Group_{i,tar}} \ \wedge \ \mathcal{G}_{group}^{can}(U_i, X_{id}^{ow,ds})}{\mathcal{PA} \vdash HAS_j\left(X_{id}^{ow,ds},t\right)}$$

$$\textbf{H5}: \frac{UnAct1_i\left(X_{id}^{ow,ds}\right) \in \mathcal{PA} \wedge unact1_i(X_{id}^{ow,ds}:V,t) \ \wedge \ \forall U_j : U_j \in Have_{Act1_i} \ \wedge \ \mathcal{G}_{unact1}^{can}(U_i, X_{id}^{ow,ds})}{\mathcal{PA} \vdash HAS_j^{not}\left(X_{id}^{ow,ds},t\right)}$$

$$\textbf{H6}: \frac{UnAct2_{i,tar}\left(X_{id}^{ow,ds}\right) \in \mathcal{PA} \wedge unact2_{i,tar}\left(X_{id}^{ds}:V,t\right) \ \wedge \forall U_j : U_j \in Have_{Act2_{i,tar}} \ \wedge \ \mathcal{G}_{unact2}^{can}(U_i, X_{id}^{ow,ds})}{\mathcal{PA} \vdash HAS_j^{not}\left(X_{id}^{ow,ds},t\right)}$$

$$\textbf{H7}: \frac{UnGroup_{i,tar}\left(X_{id}^{ow,ds}\right) \in \mathcal{PA} \wedge ungroup_{i,tar}\left(X_{id}^{ow,ds}:V,t\right) \wedge \forall U_j : U_j \in Have_{Group_{i,tar}} \wedge \mathcal{G}_{ungroup}^{can}(U_i, X_{id}^{ow,ds})}{\mathcal{PA} \vdash HAS_j^{not}\left(X_{id}^{ow,ds},t\right)}$$

$$\textbf{H8/(a)}: \frac{Possess_{sp}(enc(X_{id}^{ow,ds}, X_{key}^{sp})) \in \mathcal{PA} \wedge Possess_{sp}(X_{key}^{sp}) \in \mathcal{PA}}{\mathcal{PA} \vdash HAS_{sp}\left(X_{id}^{ow,ds}\right)}$$

$$\textbf{H8/(b)}: \frac{Possess_{sp}(X_{id}^{ow,ds}) \in \mathcal{PA}}{\mathcal{PA} \vdash HAS_{sp}\left(X_{id}^{ow,ds}\right)}$$

$$\textbf{H9}: \frac{\text{None of the pre-conditions of H1-H4 holds for any } X_{id}^{ow,ds}}{\mathcal{PA} \vdash HAS_j^{never}\left(X_{id}^{ow,ds}\right)}$$

$$\textbf{H10}: \frac{Delete_{sp}(X_{id}^{ow,ds}, dd) \in \mathcal{PA} \wedge deletereq_{sp}(X_{id}^{ow,ds}:V,t) \wedge delete_i(X_{id}^{ow,ds}:V,t')}{\mathcal{PA} \vdash HAS_j^{not}\left(X_{id}^{ow,ds},t'\right), \forall U_j \in \mathcal{U} \wedge (t'-t \leq dd)}$$

Table 4: Deduction rules.